

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

PIN	4762	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	Watershed Conservation Authority	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$450,000
PROJECT TITLE	San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers Watershed IRWMP	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$800,000

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Integrate diverse water management strategies from a variety of existing plans along with new strategies that will be developed to implement projects that will ultimately improve the quality of life for the inhabitants of the region.

**WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.**

**Score: 15**

**Comment:** The work plan includes 10 tasks, a budget, and schedule. Each task provides a methodology for implementation and presents a list of deliverables, a budget, and a schedule. The tasks nicely correspond and supplement the presentation of the Sec.1 items. Sec.2.10 presents a proposed outline for the IRWMP, and indicates that the IRWMP will be initiated in June 2005 (using local contributions) and adopted prior to January 2007. The budget is detailed with respect to labor and costs, and demonstrates a 44% funding match.

**DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 4**

**Comment:** There is a good description of the region, including resources and habitats. However, the basis for the region's boundary is not fully justified. The IRWMP region includes the Lower L.A. River and the San Gabriel River Watersheds. It also includes the Upper Santa Clara River. There is inadequate justification offered for not including the Upper L.A. River and for including the Upper Santa Clara River in the region. It is not apparent that the region is the best to integrate water management and a reviewer suggests the region should include the entire L.A. and San Gabriel River watersheds. Another reviewer states that the region is appropriate for water management and planning. It follows the established boundaries of the San Gabriel River and Lower L.A. Rivers Watershed Council. There are hydrologic links between the two rivers at Whittier Narrows. It would be logical that the San Gabriel Valley groundwater agencies (PIN #4896) join forces with this planning effort.

**OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 10**

**Comment:** Five comprehensive focus areas have been developed to determine water management strategies in the region, and specific objectives for each area are well defined. The strategies are determined through existing stakeholder driven documents discussing water management needs. The applicant discusses and considers statewide priorities. The Work Items provides detailed methods to further address and refine the objectives.

**INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 10**

**Comment:** The strategies are comprehensive and logically classified into five focus areas. A matrix is provided showing links between applicable planning documents and the water issues they address. Included is a discussion of many of these plans, their strategy associations, their integration, and their level of importance. A list of preliminary water management strategies has been developed and presented, and many are indicated as being currently implemented, consistent with IRWMP standards. Examples of integrating multiple strategies are cited from the applicant's previous work.

**IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 8**

**Comment:** A list of ready to implement (Tier 1) projects will be produced with a schedule for implementing them. Responsibility for specific projects and IRWMP implementation falls to many local agencies and groups under the guidance of the Regional Water Management Group. However, there is no discussion of how they will implement the overall IRWMP that is to be developed.

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

**IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 8**

**Comment:** Expected impacts and benefits of Tier 1 projects will be identified and discussed in the IRWMP. CEQA compliance will occur as each project is implemented and the need for future CEQA work will be identified in the IRWMP. Some CEQA work is already done or underway for different projects. However, it is not clear how the benefits of the overall IRWMP will be evaluated.

**DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 5**

**Comment:** The applicant identifies extensive technical data to support IRWMP development. The applicant's initial review of data has identified data gaps that will be considered during IRWMP development. Technical studies have been conducted and others are planned.

**DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 5**

**Comment:** The applicant has identified data that is currently housed by multiple State and local agencies, and data is being compiled from all applicable agencies for use in the IRWMP. Data is to be compiled in a database and disseminated to stakeholders and will be available for integration into statewide databases. The applicant will use a website to distribute information about the IRWMP and the associated data. The applicant states that the database will be formatted to facilitate integration into SWAMP and GAMA. GIS mapping will be incorporated.

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 5**

**Comment:** The applicant identifies many stakeholders already involved from previous efforts in the region. Methods of identifying and involving new stakeholders in the IRWMP development process will be refined and documented during IRWMP development. An intention to address environmental justice issues in the IRWMP has been expressed in this proposal, as has the intention to establish a process to include additional stakeholders.

**DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 3**

**Comment:** The applicant states that 17 of the 68 cities or unincorporated communities in the region are DACs, but how their needs will be assessed is not clear. The proposal states that the IRWMP will directly benefit DACs, but offers no specifics. No documentation of water supply and water quality needs of DACs is presented. The applicant does not identify the needs of the DACs but rather identifies a DAC (*the City of El Monte*) and a local non-profit (*Amigos de Los Rios*) whose mission is to conduct work to benefit DACs.

**RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 3**

**Comment:** There is a detailed discussion of local planning documents and some discussion of how they will relate to IRWM strategies. There is no direct discussion of the IRWMP in relation to other planning documents. The proposal needs a better mechanism for coordination with entities within the region to ensure that goals and plans complement each other, and that local planning documents do not have to prioritize competing IRWMPs. How the IRWMP will coordinate with the local plans is not clear.

**AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 4**

**Comment:** There is a great deal of existing and proposed involvement and coordination with local and state agencies, but a noticeable lack of involvement from federal agencies. The first subtask is establishing coordination with all appropriate local, State, and federal agencies and ranking entities into three groups: Regional Water Management Groups, Water Management Focus Area Subcommittees, and stakeholders. It would be logical that the San Gabriel Valley groundwater agencies (PIN #4896) join forces with this planning effort. Separate planning grant applications were submitted by the Foothill and Watershed Conservation Authority. One groundwater management agency, the Water Replenishment District, is already part of this effort covering the southeast portion of the region.

**TOTAL SCORE: 80**